

# ICPMS Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date:

Surveyor:

Laboratory:

Rev. 1, 3/04

Hard Copy Data Review	Yes	No	Comments
<b><u>Proficiency Samples:</u></b>			
1. Analysis date:			
2. PE successful?			
<b><u>Calibration:</u></b>			
1. Standard Information			
-Analysis date:			
-Analyst:			
-Instrument ID:			
-Software type:			
-File names:			
2. Quantitation Report Review			
-Does the lab have adequate hard copy data?			
-Are all standards run the same day/batch? (Check Acquired Times)			
Was the instrument tune report reviewed? Mass Calibration and Resolution checks within method criteria			
Was the daily performance report reviewed?			
-Do the standards have the proper sensitivity?			
For DW must have a RL check standard or a standard at the RL, but calibration only requires a blank and one std.			
-No significant contamination?			
3. Calibration Method Information			

<b>ICPMS Data Auditing Check Sheet</b> Date: _____ Surveyor: _____ Laboratory: _____ Rev. 1, 3/04			
-Quantitation method file name:			
-Calibration type (i.e. linear, RF, etc.):			
-Same for all compounds?			
-Was the calibration criteria specified in the laboratory SOP met for each compound?			
-Was the LDR/IEC (hw only) study results reviewed and done at the appropriate frequency?			
-Were data points eliminated from the calibration?			
-If yes, why?:			
-Was this done appropriately?			
<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			
<b><u>Sample Information:</u></b>			
-Sample date/time(from COC):			
-Were the samples properly preserved – pH less than 2, unless if a soil?			
<b><u>Sample Preparation Procedures:</u></b>			
-Extraction method or turbidity check showing less than 1 NTU (DW):			
-Extraction date/time:			
-Did the sample meet the extraction hold time?			
-Is the extraction documentation correct and complete? Acids used and temperature documentation needed			

<b>ICPMS Data Auditing Check Sheet</b> Date: _____ Surveyor: _____ Laboratory: _____ Rev. 1, 3/04			
-Was the extraction acceptable (refer to check sheets or hand notes)?			
<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			
<b><u>Sample Analysis:</u></b>			
-Sample ID:			
-Analysis date/time:			
-Was the sample hold time met (6 mo.)?			
-Was the proper QC run with the sample batch?			
-Was the QC at the proper concentrations?			
-Was the appropriate QC (including tune if MS) criteria met? Is internal standard monitored for recovery? Verify that the sample is bracketed by acceptable CCV's.			
-Do all low level QC checks have adequate sensitivity?			
-Does the hard copy data correspond to the sequence report?			
-Are there any major breaks in the acquisition times?			
-Do all the samples/QC in the batch have the same method update time?			
-No significant contamination or matrix interference?			
-Do the analytical results on the Quant Report match those on the final report?			
<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			

# ICPMS Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date:

Surveyor:

Laboratory:

Rev. 1, 3/04

Laboratory Review	Yes	No	Comments
-Was the analyst(s) available for interviewing?			
-Was the analyst(s) following proper procedure? -If no, see notes or check sheets. -If no, is SOP correct? -If no, is the QAP correct?			
-Did the lab have the proper equipment and instrumentation?			
-Did the lab have the proper reagents?			
-Did the lab have adequate documentation such as run logs, maintenance logs, temperature logs and standard logs?			
<b><u>Electronic Data Review:</u></b>	Yes	No	Comments
<b><u>In-Lab Review:</u></b>			
1. -check calibration plots and correlation if not available with hard copy			
Verify the calibration curve being used at the instrument computer, making sure it is consistent with the SOP.			
2. Initial CCV			
Can the laboratory reprint a Quant Report that matches the hard copy?			
-If yes, Attach.			
-If no, why?			
3. Other electronic data concerns (Identified in the hard copy review):			
<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			

## ICPMS Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date:

Surveyor:

Laboratory:

Rev. 1, 3/04

### **Training:**

-If significant problems are noted above, do the analyst's training files show that they were properly trained?
